

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for a period of time not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

ICE STORM 1998

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, winter is only half over, and even though there has been some stormy weather here in the Nation's Capital, sections of the Northeast experienced the ice storm of the century, maybe the millennium, earlier this month. For 2 days straight, freezing rain, snow and sleet battered the Champlain Valley of Vermont, upstate New York and parts of New Hampshire, Maine and the Province of Quebec.

Tens of thousands of trees buckled and shattered under the stress and weight of several inches of ice that coated their branches. Power lines were ripped down by falling branches and the weight of the ice, leaving hundreds of thousands of people without electricity for days and even weeks. In fact, some are still without electricity. Roads were covered with ice and rivers swelled and overflowed with heavy rain. The crippling ice storm brought activity in the area to a grinding halt.

Just a few days after the storm, Senator LEAHY and I visited the hardest hit areas of Vermont. The storm's damages were the worst I have ever seen. In the Burlington area, 20 to 25 percent of the trees in that city were toppled or must be chopped down. Another 25 percent were damaged. The storm also destroyed sugar bushes and dropped trees across hiking trails and snowmobile trails.

Mr. President, local and State emergency officials acted quickly to help their fellow Vermonters and to assess the damage. Soon after the storm, the President declared six Vermont counties a disaster. The response from FEMA was impressive, and I thank Director James Witt for standing behind Vermont.

Vermonters rallied, with the help of the National Guard, led by Adjutant General Martha Rainville, to help themselves and their neighbors.

As the temperatures dropped below zero days after the storm, with thousands still without power, volunteer firefighters, police officers and National Guard troops and every able-bodied citizen came together working day and night to help feed, heat and care for the people in their community.

Hardest hit were dairy farmers. Already struggling to make ends meet due to low milk prices, the ice storm left farms without power to milk their cows. Cows need to be milked twice a day every day. At times, cows went for hours and even days without being milked. Fortunately one of the missions of the National Guard was to get power generators to farms and to keep them running so that farmers could milk their cows and keep their milk cool and preserve the health of the cows.

One unit of the National Guard became known as the "Mobile Milking Team"—or the MMT, as is usual in the military sector to have acronyms—by going farm to farm with their generators. However, despite the efforts to bring generators to farmers, for many the damage was already done. Because the margins are already so close for many farmers, the loss of a single milk check could mean staying in business or selling out.

Mr. President, the organized and volunteer responses to this disaster were incredible. The Vermont Petroleum Association, in conjunction with Mobile Oil and R.L. Vallee Petroleum, came to the aid of the farmers and the homeowners who were relying on their generators to run their businesses and to heat their homes by graciously donating 8,000 gallons of diesel fuel.

Stories of Vermonters helping Vermonters were commonly told throughout the disaster counties in the State. Utility companies worked long hours in the cold to help clear debris and restore power. Lines men and women came from as far away as Hawaii to help repair the damage. Let me tell you, the ones from Hawaii had an adventure they will never forget.

Vermonters also helped their neighbors to the north just across the Canadian border. Two weeks after the storm first hit, over 700,000 citizens in the Province of Quebec were still without power and over 30,000 people were relying on meals from local food shelves. I teamed up with Cabot Creamery and H.P. Hood to help get 20,000 pounds of cheddar cheese, yogurt, and cottage cheese and 1,000 cases of water so necessary through the many restrictions at the border to help feed the Canadians who were driven from their homes. Many Vermonters helped by sending firewood and heating oil. Thousands of cords of wood were shipped over.

Mr. President, the citizens and trees of Vermont as well as upstate New York, Maine and New Hampshire have suffered enough from this storm. Local and State assistance will help communities and individuals get back on their feet. But Federal relief is needed to ensure that the disaster areas are not overwhelmed by their recovery.

I know I speak for Senator LEAHY and my colleagues from New York, Maine and New Hampshire when I say we all will do what we can to help. We look forward to the coming spring. But

before the arrival of warm weather, months of hard work to restore Vermont to its pristine beauty is needed. And we will all be helping, I assure you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to check on the status. I believe that under a previous order I have 30 minutes reserved. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President.

BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I asked for 30 minutes today because I think it is very important that we address an issue that will be coming before the Senate in the very near future. It is an issue that has been brought about by the President's pronouncement that he wants to keep our troops in Bosnia in an undefined mission for an undefined time.

Mr. President, I think that would be a mistake for our country. I hope the Senate will focus on this issue. Indeed, I hope the American people will focus on this issue, because it is going to set a precedent that I think is very bad.

I do not want to pull up stakes and leave Bosnia without doing it in a responsible way. I think America has that responsibility. But in fact many of us have asked the President to lay the groundwork with an established and clear mission that has a chance to succeed and a mission that has a finite term so that both our allies and any enemies of our cause would know exactly what to expect from America. But in fact both our allies and our adversaries could not possibly know what to expect from America because in fact America has said it is going to leave twice and we have not left. In fairness, we have not left because we have not laid a proper base to leave.

What I am asking the President to consider and what I would ask the American people to consider is starting the process of an honorable and responsible approach to Bosnia which includes an honorable exit.

Mr. President, we are looking at a time when our readiness is being called into question. In fact, if you look at all of the responsibilities that America has in the world, I think we are spending too much on Bosnia and therefore putting in jeopardy the security of the United States in the future and the future of our ability to respond to other places where America may have to respond even unilaterally. And, Mr. President, that is not what we should be doing.

I think it is most important that America start with the issue of Bosnia,

address it in the way that America should, and we must look at our overall responsibilities in the world.

The Bosnia operation has already diverted nearly \$8 billion from our national defense. A growing lament at the Pentagon among senior officers is that we are in danger of returning to the hollow military of the late 1970s. Let me list some of the indicators that demonstrate that our military is once again at risk.

Last year, the military had its worst recruiting year since 1979. The Army failed to meet its objective to recruit infantry soldiers, the single most important specialty in the Army.

A Senate Budget Committee investigator recently reported finding serious Army-wide personnel and readiness problems. At the National Training Center, where our troops go for advanced training, units rotating in typically come with a 60 percent shortage in mechanics and often a 50 percent shortage in infantry. These shortages were blamed on the fact that these personnel, especially the mechanics, are deployed abroad for missions such as Bosnia.

More than 350 Air Force pilots turned down the \$60,000 bonuses they would have received to remain in the cockpit another 5 years. A 29 percent acceptance rate for the bonus compares with 59 percent last year and 81 percent in 1995. Mr. President, that is stark difference.

The Air Force is finding, whatever the perks, it cannot hold on to its best pilots. Last year, about 500 pilots resigned, most of them lured to the airlines. This year, the number will top 700, and the Air Force says it is not able to train enough new pilots to replace them.

Recently, a lack of critical parts for F-16 aircraft forced two fighter squadrons in Italy to cannibalize grounded aircraft to ensure they can continue to conduct the NATO peace enforcement mission over Bosnia.

A Senate Budget Committee investigator also found that some small units are now being led by junior people because sergeants are off on peacekeeping duty. As a result, subunits, from basic squads on up, do not train with the leaders that they would go to war with, breaking the rule of "train just as you would go to war."

Since 1991, the United States has cut its Armed Forces by about a third. It may be more difficult, more risky and possibly more costly to invade Iraq again now. We are going to debate and vote on a resolution today expressing our support for the President's strong actions toward Iraq. But the fact is, if anything went wrong, we would have to divert troops from every theater in the world to prevail. This is not the best situation considering the heavy responsibilities that we have in other parts of the world.

Defense cuts of almost 50 percent over the last decade have put our security at risk. But this has been made

worse by the diversion of U.S. resources and readiness in Bosnia and elsewhere. Policymakers in the Clinton administration have spent more time discussing Haiti than China, more on Bosnia than on missile defense. We are not developing a policy that is going to put our country in the best position to deal with the myriad of issues that will face this country and our security in the next century.

The Clinton administration is missing a big-picture view of the world and the proper role for the United States. Our growing involvement in Bosnia is a very good example of that. Just last week, U.S. forces were directly involved in tracking down and capturing a war criminal who called himself "the Serb Hitler."

The Dayton accords made apprehension of war criminals a priority. But those agreements also made it clear that this responsibility would be the responsibility of the parties to Dayton—civilian police and Government officials. In fact, less than 1 year ago the former NATO commander, George Joulwan, told the Congress this:

The military are not policemen. And I think . . . the proper responsibility rests on the parties. That is what Dayton says . . . [I]f we are not careful we will go down this slippery slope where the military will be put in the position of hunting down war criminals. This is not within my mandate.

That is Gen. George Joulwan speaking.

I joined with many of my colleagues in the Senate to oppose the decision to send our troops to Bosnia. One of our principal concerns was that, once there, our mission would be indefinite and it would lead to mission creep. We were bolstered in our concerns by former Secretary of Defense William Perry and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Shalikashvili, who warned us that without a specific deadline for withdrawal, there would be the potential for expanding the mission.

I am concerned that Secretary Perry's warnings are coming true. While we were in recess, the President announced that thousands of U.S. troops would remain in Bosnia after the June 30 deadline, and remembering that the Senate had unanimously endorsed that deadline of June 30, 1998, which his administration had established.

After 240 U.S. Marines were killed in Lebanon in 1984, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger established six principles upon which the decision to send U.S. ground troops should be based. Here is what he said:

The U.S. should not commit forces unless the engagement is in our vital national interest. If we do commit forces, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. We should know how those objectives can be accomplished and we should send the appropriate forces to complete the objectives. We must constantly reassess and adjust our relationship between our objectives and forces if necessary. The commitment of troops should be a last resort, not the first.

We have violated virtually every one of Cap Weinberger's principles in Bos-

nia. Bosnia was supposed to be a 1-year peacekeeping operation that would keep the factions apart until their own forces could come in and keep the peace from the ground up. They would have local elections and general elections for their national leadership. They would begin to resettle refugees.

Two years have gone by since Dayton. I was in Brcko in August, one week before the eruption in Brcko in which U.S. troops were harmed. I was able to see how far we had come. It was my fourth trip to Bosnia, my sixth trip in 2 years to the whole region. I'm going back next week with other concerned Members of Congress.

What I saw in Brcko was the resettling of refugees who did not even meet their neighbors from the other factions, even though they were living next door to each other. The atrocities committed right there in Brcko against thousands of Muslims are as bad as anything I have ever heard reported from the Nazi atrocities in World War II, and yet we are trying to say come and live together in the American way. I have called this an attempt to Americanize the Balkans—multiethnic neighborhoods which we, thank goodness, do have in America—but forcing people to do this so prematurely could be antipeaceful. I think it is going to prolong the uprisings if we try to force this before the people themselves are ready, before the wounds have healed from the atrocities that have been committed.

That is why I have suggested that perhaps it would be better to take one step in between. Let the peace settle in. Let the economic development start. The geographic regions established by the conflict and endorsed by the Dayton accords are nearly 90 percent homogenous. The Bosnian state is 90 percent Muslim. Srpska, the Serb part of Bosnia, is 95 percent Serb. Croatia is almost exclusively Croatian.

Within these divisions they are beginning to be able to have a semblance of government, but they are not going to get economic stability if forced refugee settlement continues to cause further conflict.

The "elections" that they held last year were elections in which the voters came in under armed guard. They voted for people who cannot live there. They left under armed guard and the people elected cannot serve. They are themselves exiles from the regions they "represent." We have declared that a victory. Mr. President, people elected by voters under armed guard, and the people elected are not even living there is not what I consider an election in our sense of the word.

There are other things that I hope we consider in trying to have a positive approach to the situation we face today. There are a variety of conditions that I suggest would lay a ground work for a peaceful situation in Bosnia, that would allow them to begin to grow and build in economic stability, and in

which America could have an honorable exit. Hopefully, our European allies and our Russian allies who are there on the ground, as well, would be able to leave the country in the hands of its own people.

First, reconvene the Dayton parties for a progress check. Be willing to modify where it is necessary. Dayton was certainly brought about by people who want to do the right thing. It is not bad to say that we should come back together and assess where we are 2 years later and modify, if necessary. I think the administration could take the lead here.

Second, establish a civilian-led and operated police training task force. Establish a police training academy capable of graduating 500 police every quarter. A similar process was attempted in Haiti. General Joulwan was a strong supporter of this approach.

Third, establish the remaining ground troops as a combined joint task force in accordance with the President's own partnership for peace initiative, originally under American command, but to be turned over to allied command within a specific period of months. This should include significant participation by prospective NATO allies—Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary—as an opportunity to bear the burden of post-cold war European security.

Four, require the administration to make a supplemental appropriations request for Bosnia of a specified duration in advance of its spending the funds. Mr. President, this should not come from our defense budget. We cannot take from our defense readiness to the tune of \$3 billion a year and expect to be able to keep a military that has a quality of life that would continue to attract our best and brightest, and it most certainly should not take from our strategic defenses for the future.

Last, build a firewall between Bosnia operating funds and procurement and research and development funds. It is very important that we begin to look at letting the people of Bosnia have some form of self-determination. Without conditioning our continued troop commitment to Bosnia, I'm afraid we are trying to put a round peg in a square hole. We would be looking at American troops indefinitely. We would be looking at a never-ending commitment, and we would be taking resources that are vitally necessary for our own security and for our responsibilities around the world.

Mr. President, I think it is most important that we look at this issue of Bosnia and establish a policy that has a chance to succeed. If the President would do that, I would be the first in line to support the decision. As a matter of fact, I think keeping thousands of troops in a 30,000-troop enclave in Bosnia in perpetuity is not good military strategy and is not based on a policy that has a chance to succeed. Remember what General Shalikashvili said, and that is that having a defined

deadline is important to avoid mission creep. We have learned that before and we should not forget that lesson. I think it is important that we continue to reassess Bosnia because this is laying the predicate for our responsibilities and our actions in the world in the future.

I think it is possible to have a policy that has a chance to succeed with honorable American involvement. I think Americans will support a continued troop commitment if it has a chance to succeed. Teddy Roosevelt was right. He said "America must speak softly and carry a big stick." That is the role of a superpower. We don't have to shout. We do not have to have troops on the ground at every civil uprising around the world. If we do, we make enemies and we are in danger of doing that right now with the Serbs. We will become the focal point and the target of the hostilities and then we will be in a situation where we will have to defend ourselves. We need to step back and act like a superpower.

Once we make a commitment we must be willing to back it up and do what we say we are going to do. That is what is so important about acting firmly in Iraq. We must be a good and solid ally and we must be a feared and respected enemy. That is what a superpower should be. We must realize our place in the world. Make sure our defenses are strong. Make sure we are not dissipating our resources to such an extent that we will not be there when only we have the capacity to act.

I will close with a quote from John Quincy Adams when he was President, and it is still good today. "America well knows, that while once enlisting under other banners than her own, she will involve herself beyond extraction in all wars of interest and intrigue. The fundamental maxims of her policy would change from loyalty to force, wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or will be unfurled there will America's heart be. She goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is a well wisher to the freedom and independence of all."

Mr. President, it is most important that America not succumb to the penchant for wanting to go out and get involved in every conflict in the world but remember as a superpower we have a unique capability to bring warring parties to the table because we are not a party that is hostile to any nation. Mr. President, we could lose that special status that we have in the world if we do not remain strong within ourselves and we will not remain strong if we continue to dissipate our resources so that our own readiness and our own strategic capabilities are in any way diminished.

I ask my colleagues to help in working with the President and this administration to pursue an honorable policy with our allies in Bosnia, a policy that has a chance to succeed and respects the fact that when we put troops in harm's way it is under the most lim-

ited circumstances and only when there is a United States security issue before us. That is not the case in Bosnia. We must help the people of Bosnia but not with continued presence of thousands of troops on the ground when their place can be taken by the parties and the people who live in Bosnia and who we hope will live in peace with our guidance for the years to come.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have an order at this time, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from West Virginia shall be recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE: THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the United States completed a major round of international global climate change negotiations at Kyoto, Japan, on December 11, 1997. Senators and staff members from the Senate Monitoring Group, created by the Senate leadership in accord with the recommendation in Senate Resolution 98, adopted last July 25, 1997, were included on the U.S. delegation. The Senate was well represented at the talks. The chairman of the Monitoring Group, Senator CHUCK HAGEL, as well as Senators JOHN KERRY, JOHN CHAFEE, JOE LIEBERMAN, MAX BAUCUS, and MIKE ENZI, dedicated considerable time and effort there to understand the issues being debated and to engage our negotiators on those issues. They have reported mixed results at the negotiations. The U.S., together with the other 39 industrialized nations, agreed to specific, legally binding targets for emissions of six greenhouse gases. The United States agreed to a numerical target of reducing greenhouse gases by 7 percent below 1990 during a budget period between 2008 and 2012. According to the administration, this commitment is actually about a 3 percent reduction below the 1990 emissions level after other technical provisions of the protocol are included in the calculations. It should be noted, however, that the administration has not yet provided the economic analysis to demonstrate how their calculations result in a 3 percent reduction, rather than 7 percent.

The rules of this U.N.-sponsored conference allow decisionmaking by consensus. Therefore, only those provisions not subject to major dispute were included in the final protocol, and one can say that the United States and all